

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. New claims 11 and 12 are added, and Claims 1-12 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The claims explicitly specify that it is the packets that have been transmitted (“packets having been transmitted”). Further, “the corresponding access cycle” clearly refers to the access cycle during which the packets have been transmitted; hence, during a given access cycle packets will be transmitted, and entries identifying those packets transmitted during the given access cycle will be stored in the table. Hence, it is believed the claims as originally filed satisfy §112, second paragraph.

Nevertheless, claims 1-2 and 8-9 have been amended to overcome the objections identified in the Official Action; as such, these amendments are purely cosmetic and do not narrow the scope of the claims.

For these and other reasons, the §112, second paragraph should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,778 to Fung. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Fung et al. neither discloses nor suggests the claimed features. For example, col. 10, lines 51-53 and col. 10, line 61 to col. 11, line 13 specifies:

Tasks desiring to send data to a node other than the one that they are on send the data through a transmitting portion of the Transaction Interface 210. . . . It may take multiple transactions to complete a non-time critical TMC block request. Once the transactions are complete, the Transaction Interface 210 sends notice to the task that is sending the data that the task is complete.

Each transaction that is initiated by the Transaction Interface 210 has a hardware timer associate with it. The hardware timer is used for timekeeping the transaction timeout. A retry count field of the TMC block is incremented if the data transmission is unsuccessful. As long as the retry count is below the programmable maximum number of retries, the Transaction Interface 210 will attempt to send the data again. If the maximum retry count has been exceeded, a status message is sent back to the calling task informing it of the failure. At the completion of a transaction, i.e., the Transaction Interface 210 received an acknowledgment from the node to which the data is being sent, the Transaction Interface 210 schedules a transaction completion status or other response data to return to the calling task. The data is placed into a DMC block and sent through the Dispatcher 220 to the calling task.

Further, col. 17, lines 40-50 merely specify that a retry count field is incremented each time the transaction interface attempts a retry until a limit is reached:

The "retry count" field is incremented each time the transaction interface attempts a retry. Once the retry count field equals the "retry\_count" contained in word 2, bits 8-10 of the TMC block 310, no more retries takes place and the Transaction Interface 210 terminates the current transaction. An error is then reported to the requesting task. Once the error is reported, the retry count field of the data structure 350 is reset to an initial value. Finally, the default queue head pointer of each element is stored in the last field for each element. Values in this data structure 350 are updated by the Transaction Interface 210 during normal operation.

As apparent from the foregoing, Fung et al. neither disclose nor suggest the claimed features of storing, each access cycle, a plurality of entries that identify respective packets, wherein the packets have been transmitted during said each access cycle according to a service protocol requiring an acknowledgement message receipt within a prescribed time interval, as claimed. Rather, Fung et al. merely discloses a timer used to track a transaction timeout: the Transaction Interface will continue to retry sending the data so long as the the number of retries is below the value specified in the retry count field.

Independent claims 1 and 8, however, specify storing the entries each access cycle that

identify the packets that were transmitted during said each access cycle: as illustrated in Figure 2, the four entries associated QP number "100" are written at the end of the first access cycle N1, and the two entries associated with the QP number "256" are written at the end of the second access cycle N2 (see, e.g., page 10, lines 17-25 and page 11, lines 5-8).

Hence, Fung et al. neither discloses the concept of an access cycle, as claimed, where entries are stored in groups based on a given access cycle, as claimed.

For these and other reasons, the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is and condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), to Deposit Account No. 50-0687, under Order No. 95-391, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Manelli Denison & Selter, PLLC



Leon R. Turkevich  
Registration No. 34,035

Customer No. 20736  
**Date: January 30, 2004**